103.1027.01

REMARKS:

Status

After this response, claims 1 to 7, 13 to 22, 27 to 36, and 41 to 43 are pending. Claims 8 to 11, 23 to 26, and 37 to 40 have been cancelled herein. No claims have been amended. Claims 1, 13, 16, 27, 30 and 41 are the independent claims. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1 to 7, 16 to 22, and 20 to 36: These claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,327,677 (Garg). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Independent claim 1 is reproduced below for the Examiner's convenience:

> 1. A method, including steps of
> repeatedly reviewing monitoring statistics regarding operation of a file server, said steps of reviewing being performed at least as often as a selected time period; and
> processing said monitoring statistics using a diagnostic software module, in response to said steps of repeatedly reviewing;
> wherein said diagnostic software module diagnoses a behavior of said file server by comparing said monitoring statistics to rules or patterns representing abnormal states of operation for said file server.

The applied art, namely Garg, is not seen by Applicant to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of claim 1, at least with respect to "diagnos[ing] a behavior of said file server by comparing said monitoring statistics to rules or patterns representing abnormal states of operation for said file server."

-10-

103.1027.01

The Office Action stated that "by identifying what is normal, what is abnormal is subsequently identified as well (i.e., anything that is not normal)." However, claim 1 does not merely recite identifying that operations are abnormal (i.e., not normal). Rather, claim 1 recites diagnosing behavior by comparing to rules or patterns representing abnormal states.

Applicant believes that an analogy might serve to help illustrate this point. This analogy involves diagnosis of an illness.

A person who is ill can determine that they are ill because they do not feel normal. However, this determination is entirely different from a diagnosis by a doctor through matching the person's symptoms to a specific rule or pattern matching a particular illness. Likewise, the claimed feature of "diagnos[ing] ... behavior ... by comparing said monitoring statistics to rules or patterns representing abnormal states of operation" goes well beyond simply determining that abnormal operations (i.e., something other than normal operations) are occurring. (The foregoing analogy is not an admission that the medical arts are analogous or applicable to the subject matter of this case; rather, the analogy is made for reasons of illustration only.)

In support of this position, Applicant notes that Garg does not appear to use "rules or patterns representing abnormal states." Rather, Garg's "cognitive signature[s] represent[] the normal operating mode for a particular network device, network interface, system, application, or communication link with which the cognitive signature is associated." Garg, col. 5, lines 32 to 35.

Accordingly, Applicant does not see Garg to disclose or to suggest claim 1's feature of "diagnos[ing] a behavior of said file server by comparing said monitoring statistics to

-11-

103.1027.01

rules or patterns representing abnormal states of operation for said file server." Reconsideration

and withdrawal are therefore respectfully requested of the § 103(a) rejection of claim 1 and its

dependent claims 2 to 7, as is allowance of those claims.

Claims 16 to 22 recite file servers that implement the methods of claims 1 to 7.

Claims 30 to 36 recite memories that store instructions for performing the methods of claims 1 to

7. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal also are respectfully requested of the § 103(a)

rejection of claims 16 to 22 and 30 to 36, as is allowance of those claims.

Claims 8 to 11, 23 to 26, and 37 to 40: These claims were rejected under § 103(a)

over "TCP/IP Illustrated Volume 1: The Protocols" (Stevens). Applicant has cancelled claims 8

to 11, 23 to 26, and 37 to 40 without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter, rendering this

rejection moot.

Claims 13 to 15, 27 to 29, and 41 to 43: These claims were rejected under §

103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,745,669 (Hugard). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Independent claim 13 is reproduced below for the Examiner's convenience:

> 13. A method, including steps of
> tracking configuration changes to a file server;
> identifying changes in monitoring statistics for said file server that
> indicate an error or other failure in said file server;
> relating said changes in said monitoring statistics to timing of said
> configuration changes; and
> determining, in response to said steps of tracking and of relating, a
> configuration change most likely to be responsible for said error or other
> failure in said file server.

The applied art, namely Hugard, is not seen by Applicant to disclose or to suggest

the foregoing features of claim 13, at least with respect to "determining, in response to said steps

-12-

103.1027.01

of ... relating [said changes in said monitoring statistics to timing of said configuration changes], a configuration change most likely to be responsible for said error or other failure in said file server."

Hugard discloses restoration of configuration information when a user indicates that software is not working as expected. See Hugard at col. 7, lines 59 to 62. Applicant does not see Hugard to determine what information to restore in response to relating changes in monitoring statistics to timing of configuration changes. Rather, Hugard provides a mechanism whereby the user selects what information to restore. For example, Hugard permits user selection of a partial restore (col. 9, line 43), a full restore (col. 10, line 8), a restoration of only some of the files that have changed (col. 10, lines 60 and 61), a restoration of specified files (col. 10, line 65), a restoration of all files that have changed (col. 11, line 17), a restoration of CMOS memory, a restoration of changed or missing files (col. 12, line 34), etc.

The Office Action apparently is equating Hugard's user selection of what information to restore with the claimed determination of which configuration change is most likely to be responsible for an error or other failure. Even if this analysis is correct (a point which Applicant does not concede), nothing in Hugard is seen by Applicant to teach or even to suggest that such a determination is made in response to relating changes in monitoring statistics to timing of configuration changes, as recited by claim 13.

In support of this position, Applicant notes that Hugard does not even teach the use of monitoring statistics. The Office Action conceded this point, taking Official Notice of "thresholding" in relation to monitoring statistics. However, Applicant submits that without

-13-

103.1027.01

teaching the use of monitoring statistics, Hugard cannot teach determining which configuration change is most likely to be responsible for an error or failure at least in part in response to a relationship between such statistics and timing of configuration changes.

Accordingly, Applicant does not see Hugard to disclose or to suggest claim 13's feature of "determining, in response to said steps of ... relating [changes in said monitoring statistics to timing of said configuration changes in], a configuration change most likely to be responsible for said error or other failure in said file server." Reconsideration and withdrawal are therefore respectfully requested of the § 103(a) rejection of claim 13 and its dependent claims 14 and 15, as is allowance of those claims.

Claims 27 to 29 recite file servers that implement the methods of claims 13 to 15. Claims 41 to 43 recite memories that store instructions for performing the methods of claims 13 to 15. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal also are respectfully requested of the § 103(a) rejection of claims 27 to 29 and 41 to 43, as is allowance of those claims.

Closing

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

[THE REST OF THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

-14-

103.1027.01

Applicant's undersigned attorney can be reached at (614) 486-3585. All

correspondence should continue to be directed to the address indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 4, 2003

Dane C. Butzer
Reg. No. 43,521

The Swernofsky Law Group
P.O. Box 390013
Mountain View, CA 94039-0013
(650) 947-0700

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 0·5 2003

OFFICIAL

-15-